UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,576	01/28/2005	Moonish R Patel	070602-0568	8806
	7590 11/18/200 WILL & EMERY LL	EXAMINER		
18191 VON KARMAN AVE. SUITE 500 IRVINE, CA 92612-7108			DINH, TIEN QUANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/522,576	PATEL ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Tien Dinh	3644		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 At</u> 2a) ■ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ■ This     3) ■ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-24 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)  1) \[ \sum \text{Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)} \]	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         Paper No(s)/Mail Date     </li> </ol>	4) interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hosick et al.

Hosick et al teaches a system that provides attitude control. The system has control logic/modules to control the reaction wheel 40 assemblies and gimbaled thruster assemblies 22 during orbit transfers or any other maneuvers as desired that can result in minimal gimbal stepping. The system has processors and software. The maneuver control module has a momentum adjust module and a gimbal module that constantly take into account the operations of the reaction wheel and the thrusters and use first, second, and third output signals to control the spacecrafts. When there is a torque deficit, the system as a whole adjust the reaction wheels and the thrusters so that the correct maneuvering commands are sent to the wheels and the thrusters. See column 7, lines 1-52. See column 9, lines 29-45. See column 10, lines 6-21. See column 11, lines 9-23. In addition, column 9, lines 12-20, teaches that both the momentum wheels and the electric thrusters can both be used to "steer" the spacecraft. Since both the thrusters and the wheels are used to steer the spacecraft, both of these devices determines how each are supposed to act to each other so that the spacecraft can be steered correctly. In other

word, if the thrusters produce a certain amount of thrust that does not have desired amount of thrust, the momentum wheels make up the torque deficit to produce the desired steering.

Re amended claims 1, 6, a computer system as clearly shown in figure 17 shows has a processor and a memory element. A person skilled in the art would clearly know that computer has a processor and a memory element. A memory unit can be in the unit 210 or 230. This is where instructions or data are stored. The processor 210 accesses its programs and performs the desired programmed command taking into account the sensor suite and the desired profile. Hosick et al teaches what has been claimed. The processor then controls the wheel system 240 and thruster devices 22 to control the spacecraft attitude dynamics.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita 6622969 in view of Goodzeit 6481672.

Yamashita discloses a system having control logic/control module/processors (that is part of the parts 8, 6, 9, 4, 5, see figures 4-8) to control reaction wheel assemblies 7 and control logic/control module/processors to control the thrusters 10 are well known. The system can operate during orbit transfers. The use of reaction wheels and thrusters results in minimal gimbal stepping since they work together. Yamashita is silent on the gimbaled thrusters. However,

Art Unit: 3644

Goodzeit discloses a system having control logic/processor to control gimbaled thrusters are well known. See abstract.

It would have been obvious one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used processor to control gimbaled thrusters in Yamashita's system as taught by Goodzeit to allow great maneuverability to the spacecraft.

Re claims 5 and 10, parts 8, 6, 9, 4, 5 have processors and hence software etc.

Re claim 11, the maneuver control module, which is comprised of parts 8, 9, 4, 5, 6, are used to control the maneuvers of the spacecraft. The maneuver control module has a momentum adjust module which control the thruster 10 and reaction wheel 7. The second output is the thruster momentum adjusts torque and a third output relating to the integral momentum adjust torque, which is the summation of the thruster output and reaction wheel before it is "pointed" to the satellite dynamics 1. When there is a torque deficit, the gimbal module is sent back to the main control module via elements 16, 19. The reaction wheel control module would then generate the signal to the momentum wheel assemblies to adjust the maneuvers of the spacecraft as desired in part of the reiterations.

Re amended claims 1, 6, a computer system as clearly shown in figures 4-8 has a processor and a memory element. A person skilled in the art would clearly know that computer has a processor and a memory element. A memory unit is where instructions or data can be stored. The processor accesses its programs and performs the desired programmed command taking into account the sensor suite and the desired profile.

Application/Control Number: 10/522,576 Page 5

Art Unit: 3644

Claims 2, 3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita 6622969 as modified by Goodzeit 6481672 as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Baldwin et al 6870164.

Yamashita 6622969 as modified by Goodzeit 6481672 discloses all claimed parts except for the Hall Current Thrusters. However, Baldwin et al discloses that Hall Current Thrusters are well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Hall Current Thrusters in Yamashita 6622969's system as modified by Goodzeit 6481672 and as taught by Baldwin et al as a substitution of parts to have a lighter thruster system.

Claims 2, 3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosick et al 6032904 in view of Baldwin et al 6870164

Hosick et al discloses all claimed parts except for the Hall Current Thrusters. However, Baldwin et al discloses that Hall Current Thrusters are well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Hall Current Thrusters in Hosick's system as taught by Baldwin et al as a substitution of parts to have a lighter thruster system.

## Response to Arguments

The examiner maintains that the prior arts still read upon what has been claimed. The examiner also wants to point out that a computer is defined as "A programmable machine that performs high-speed processing of numbers, as well as of text, graphics, symbols, and sound. All computers contain a central processing unit that interprets and executes instructions; input devices, such as a keyboard and a mouse, through which data and commands enter the computer; memory that enables the computer to store programs and data; and output devices, such as printers and display screens, that show the results after the computer has processed data. "

If applicant has any doubt that Hosick or Yamashita does not discloses a "computer", then applicant should read what a computer is and how it functions.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/522,576 Page 7

Art Unit: 3644

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-6899. The examiner can normally be reached on 12-8.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mansen can be reached on 571-272-6608. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tien Dinh/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3644